

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

RONALD ARMBRESTER, #265 891,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:20-cv-77-WHA
)	[WO]
CORIZON HEALTH SERVICE, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff, an inmate incarcerated at the Easterling Correctional Facility in Clio, Alabama, files this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 challenging Defendants’ alleged deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs. The named defendants include Corizon Health Services, Inc., Wexford Health Services, Inc., Dr. Jean Darbouze, Dr. P. Wilson, and the Alabama Department of Corrections [“ADOC”]. Upon review, the court concludes that dismissal of Plaintiff’s claims against the ADOC prior to service is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1).

I. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Prison Litigation Reform Act, as partially codified at 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, requires this court to screen complaints filed by prisoners against government officers or employees as early as possible in the litigation. The court must dismiss the complaint or any portion thereof that it finds frivolous, malicious, seeks monetary damages from a defendant immune from monetary relief, or which states no claim upon which relief can be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1) & (2). The court may *sua sponte* dismiss a prisoner’s complaint prior to service. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a).

Under § 1915A(b)(1) the court may dismiss a claim which “lacks an arguable basis in law or fact” as frivolous. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). A claim is frivolous when

it “has little or no chance of success,” that is, when it appears “from the face of the complaint that the factual allegations are clearly baseless or that the legal theories are indisputably meritless.” *Carroll v. Gross*, 984 F.2d 392, 393 (11th Cir. 1993). A claim is frivolous as a matter of law where the defendants are immune from suit, *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327, the claim seeks to enforce a right that clearly does not exist, *id.*, or there is an affirmative defense that would defeat the claim, such as the statute of limitations, *Clark v. Georgia Pardons & Paroles Bd.*, 915 F.2d 636, 640 n.2 (11th Cir. 1990). Courts are accorded “not only the authority to dismiss [as frivolous] a claim based on indisputably meritless legal theory, but also the unusual power to pierce the veil of the complaint’s factual allegations and dismiss those claims whose factual contentions are clearly baseless.” *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327.

The court may dismiss a complaint, or any portion thereof, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1) for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Dismissal under § 1915A(b)(1) may be granted “only if it is clear that no relief could be granted under any set of facts that could be proved consistent with the allegations.” *Hishon v. King & Spalding*, 467 U.S. 69, 73 (1984) (citing *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957)). A review on this ground is governed by the same standards as dismissals for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 215 (2007). To state a claim upon which relief may be granted, “a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (internal quotation marks omitted). To state a claim to relief that is plausible, the plaintiff must plead factual content that “allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* The allegations should present a “‘plain statement’ possess[ing] enough heft to ‘show that the pleader is entitled to relief.’” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544,

557 (2007) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1-2)). “Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice.” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. When a successful affirmative defense, such as a statute of limitations, appears on the face of a complaint, dismissal for failure to state a claim is also warranted. *Jones*, 549 U.S. at 215.

Pro se pleadings “are held to a less stringent standard than pleadings drafted by attorneys” and are liberally construed. *Boxer X v. Harris*, 437 F.3d 1107, 1110 (11th Cir. 2006). However, they “must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555.

II. DISCUSSION

Plaintiff names the ADOC as a defendant. The Eleventh Amendment bars suit directly against a state or its agencies, regardless of relief sought. *Pennhurst State School & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984); *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 276 (1986) (holding that unless a state consents to suit a plaintiff cannot proceed against the State or its agencies as the action is proscribed by the Eleventh Amendment and “[t]his bar exists whether the relief sought is legal or equitable.”).

“[T]he Eleventh Amendment prohibits federal courts from entertaining suits by private parties against States and their agencies [or employees].” *Alabama v. Pugh*, 438 U.S. 781, 781, 98 S.Ct. 3057, 57 L.Ed.2d 1114 (1978). There are two exceptions to this prohibition: where the state has waived its immunity or where Congress has abrogated that immunity. *Virginia Office for Prot. & Advocacy v. Stewart*, 563 U.S. 247, 131 S.Ct. 1632, 1637–38, 179 L.Ed.2d 675 (2011). “A State’s consent to suit must be ‘unequivocally expressed’ in the text of [a] relevant statute.” *Sossamon v. Texas*, 563 U.S. 277, 131 S. Ct. 1651, 1658, 179 L.Ed.2d 700 (2011) (quoting *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 98, 104 S. Ct. 900, 79 L.Ed.2d 67 (1984)). “Waiver may not be implied.” *Id.* Likewise, “Congress’ intent to abrogate the States’ immunity from suit must be obvious from ‘a clear legislative statement.’” *Seminole Tribe of Fla. v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44, 55, 116 S.Ct. 1114, 134 L.Ed.2d 252 (1996) (quoting *Blatchford v. Native Vill. of Noatak*, 501 U.S. 775, 786, 111 S.Ct. 2578, 115 L.Ed.2d 686 (1991)).

Selensky v. Alabama, 619 F. App'x 846, 848–49 (11th Cir. 2015). Thus, neither the State of Alabama nor its agencies may be sued unless the State has waived its Eleventh Amendment immunity (*see Pennhurst*, 465 U.S. at 100), or Congress has abrogated the State's immunity (*see Seminole Tribe v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44, 59 (1996)).

Neither waiver nor abrogation applies here. The Alabama Constitution states that “the State of Alabama shall never be made a defendant in any court of law or equity.” Ala. Const. art. I, § 14. The Supreme Court has recognized that this prohibits Alabama from waiving its immunity from suit. *Pugh*, 438 U.S. at 782, 98 S.Ct. 3057 (citing Ala. Const. art. I, § 14.)

Selensky, 619 Fed. App'x at 849. “Alabama has not waived its Eleventh Amendment immunity in § 1983 cases, nor has Congress abated it.” *Holmes v. Hale*, 701 F. App'x 751, 753 (11th Cir. 2017) (citing *Carr v. City of Florence*, 916 F.2d 1521, 1525 (11th Cir. 1990)). Consequently, any claims lodged against the State of Alabama or its agencies are frivolous as these claims are “based on an indisputably meritless legal theory.” *Neitzke*, 490 U.S. at 327.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that:

1. Plaintiff's complaint against Defendant Alabama Department of Corrections be DISMISSED with prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1);
2. Defendant Alabama Department of Corrections be DISMISSED as a party to the complaint prior to service; and
3. This case be REFERRED to the undersigned for further proceedings.

It is

ORDERED that **on or before March 31, 2020**, the parties may file an objection to the Recommendation. Any objection filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which a party objects. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections

will not be considered by the District Court. This Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file a written objection to the proposed findings and advisements in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation shall bar a party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of issues covered in the Recommendation and shall bar a party from attacking on appeal factual findings in the Recommendation accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982). *See Stein v. Reynolds Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc), adopting as binding precedent all of the decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to the close of business on September 30, 1981.

DONE on this 16th day of March, 2020.

/s/ Jerusha T. Adams
JERUSHA T. ADAMS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE